



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,127	11/17/2003	William T. Donofrio	END0745USDIV2	6095
27777 7590 07/29/2009 PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			EXAMINER NGUYEN, VI X	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/716,127

Applicant(s)

DONOFRIO ET AL.

Examiner

Victor X. Nguyen

Art Unit

3734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 61-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 61-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CI/CC)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/8/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the RCE filed on 12/8/2008.

Claims 61-64 are pending in this present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beuchat et al 5,499,969 in view of Podany et al 6,013,048 and Holland, Jr. et al 6,053,886.

Claims 61-62: Beuchat et al et al disclose an ultrasonic surgical hand-piece (see col. 1, lines 16-20), providing a switch (not shown, see col. 8, lines 40-41) located on a housing; monitoring pressure applied to the switch (see col. 10, lines 16-19;

Beuchat et al et a fail to teach activating the handpiece at a first power level if the monitored pressure reaches a first threshold; deactivating the handpiece if the monitored pressure reaches a second threshold; and providing a switching functionality according to a lagging effect as the monitored pressured is changed.

Podany et al teach activating the handpiece at a first power level if the monitored pressure reaches a first threshold; deactivating the handpiece if the monitored pressure reaches a second threshold (col. 4, lines 45-59). It is noted that there will be some indication of pressure as switch 62 is turned on. While activating the hand-piece at a first power level

(the first power occurs where the switch 62 is turned on) would permit the monitored pressure reached a first threshold. Alternatively, deactivating the hand-piece would permit the monitored pressure reached a second threshold. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to modify Bucchat with activating the handpiece at a first power level if the monitored pressure reaches a first threshold; deactivating the handpiece if the monitored pressure reaches a second threshold as taught by Podany in order to allow the device to operate at a power level corresponding to the desired threshold.

Holland, Jr. et al teach providing a switching functionality according to a lagging effect as the monitored pressured is changed (col. 8, lines 44-46, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-6). It is well known in the art, specifically *lagging effect can be broadly interpreted as a response time or time delay*, when the pressure applied or forces acted on the switch that are changed (The examiner interprets lagging effect as a time delay, where first delay circuit provides an operational delay... and where a second delay circuit is provided such that a time delay is introduced into the response of the entire system, see Holland, col. 8, lines 46-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to modify Bucchat with providing a switching functionality according to a lagging effect as the monitored pressured is changed as taught by Holland in order to provide a response time or time delay, when the pressure applied or forces acted on the switch that are changed.

2. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beuchat et al in view of Podany et al and Holland, Jr. et al. as applied to claim 61 above and further in view of Culp et al 6,090,123.

The modified method of Beuchat discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the pressure is monitored by a sensor located inside the housing of the handpiece selected from a group consisting of an electro-mechanical switch, a force-sensitive resistor, force sensitive capacitor, strain gauge, magnet, ferromagnet, piezo film and piezo ceramic. However, Culp et al disclose the pressure is monitored by a sensor located inside the housing of the handpiece selected from a group consisting of an electro-mechanical switch, a force-sensitive resistor, force sensitive capacitor, strain gauge, magnet, ferromagnet, piezo film and piezo ceramic (fig. 1, col. 64, lines 8-22 and claim 23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the pressure is monitored by a sensor located inside the housing of the handpiece selected from a group consisting of an electro-mechanical switch, a force-sensitive resistor, force sensitive capacitor, strain gauge, magnet, ferromagnet, piezo film and piezo ceramic with the modified step of Beuchat, in order to provide sensing means that is easily mounted in a surgical hand piece (col. 64, lines 8-22 and claim 23), as taught by Culp et al.

3. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beuchat et al in view of Podany et al and Holland, Jr. et al. as applied to claim 61 above and further in view of Kusunoki et al 5,529,580.

The modified method of Beuchat discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the switch is generally aligned with a blade as the blade is rotated.

However, Kusunoki et al disclose the switch is generally aligned with a blade as the blade is rotated (fig. 1, element 13, see col. 6, lines 22-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the switch is generally aligned with a blade as the blade is rotated with the modified step of Beuchat, in order to gain the advantage of cutting the tissue easily (see col. 6, lines 22-29), as taught by *Kusunoki et al*.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor X. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4699. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8-4.30 P.M).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anh Tuan Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VN/

/Anh Tuan T. Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731
7/20/2009